

**REMARKS**

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1-22 are in the application.

Claims 1-2, and 4-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,375).

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

“...jog dial means for enabling an operator to perform said first operation, said second operation, and said third operation...”

It is respectfully submitted that Jain as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Jain”) does not teach the above-recited feature. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Jain.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, amended independent claims 11, 15, and 19 are believed to be distinguishable from Jain.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 depend from one of claims 1, 11, 15, and 19, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Jain for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,375) in view of Feyereisen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,277 B1).

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from Jain for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Feyereisen to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Jain. Accordingly, claim 3 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Jain and Feyereisen.


In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800